

REMARKS

New claims 16 to 20 have been added. Support for those claims can be found throughout the Specification and in the originally filed claims. No new matter has been added.

This Amendment is being filed along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Claims 6 to 20 are now pending.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments to the claims, and the below remarks.

In an earlier Office Action, claims 6 to 8, 10 to 13, and 15, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,170,005 to Meandzija (“Meandzija reference”) in view of WO 96/07267 to Chaney (“Chaney reference”).

The Meandzija reference refers to synchronization and information exchange between communication components using a network management operations and control paradigm. The Meandzija reference concerns a management entity component, such as a computer workstation operated at a control center, coordinates the actions of different agent components, such as hardware used at the headend or uplink site of a television network.

The Chaney reference concerns a system processing a video signal including a plurality of signal components representing respective ones of a plurality of video programs such as pay-TV programs.

In contrast to both the Meandzija and Chaney references, claim 5 is directed to a method for clearing a customer-specific entitlement in a conditional access system to receive a chargeable service from a service provider by using a security module including: specifically assigning an EMM clearing signal to the security module to provide a specifically assigned EMM clearing signal; and controlling a right-of-access by a customer through a service center, in response to a request from the service provider to the service center, using the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal by performing one of: (i) an indirect clearing operation of: sending the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal from the service center to the service provider via at least one of a telephone system and a data communication system; feeding the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal for the chargeable service into a control unit of the service provider; and activating the security module via the control unit by using the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal; and (ii) a direct clearing operation by sending the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal from the service center, with an assistance of a data transmission service in a digital broadcasting

service, to the security module to clear the customer. Neither reference – alone or in combination – describe each and every feature of claim 5 as required. For example, the Meandzija reference concerns agent components, such as hardware used at the headend or uplink site of a television network, to provide conditional access to a television signal by inserting conditional access data into the transmitted programming, where management information bases are provided for the agent components and the agent components update their management information bases with changes, for example, in television schedule. And the management component reads the management information bases to obtain the updated information and store its own management information base. The Meandzija reference does not teach or suggest the security focus of the present invention, specifically, for example, the multi-step tasks provided in claim 10. Further, the Chaney reference does not teach or suggest the security focus either. Instead, the Chaney reference appears to concern itself with a system processing a video signal. Accordingly, the Meandzija and Chaney reference do not expressly recite all of the elements of claim 5, and thus, do not render obvious claim 5. The remaining claims 6, 7, 9 to 12, and 14, are dependent on or recite features analogous to claim 5. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 5 to 14, renumbered above and in Applicants' response to the Office Action made final, as claims 6 to 15, are allowable.

In earlier Office Action, claims 9 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Meandzija reference in view of the Chaney reference and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,448 to Hayes, Jr. (“Hayes reference”).

As discussed above, the Meandzija reference in combination with the Chaney reference does not teach or suggest the features of claim 9. Likewise, the Hayes reference does not cure those deficiencies.

The Hayes reference recites a method and apparatus for effectuating unidirectional and bidirectional communication directly between a mobile telephone and another device without the use of a mobile telephone to carry. The Hayes reference does not teach or suggest the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal for clearing the querying customer which is only routed into a digital broadcasting network in which the querying customer is situated at a time of a call and an ordering of the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal as recited in claim 9. Claim 14 recites features analogous to those of claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9 and 14 are allowable over the cited art.

New claims 16 to 20 recite features analogous to those of claim 5, and are allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 5 over the art addressed above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the rejections of claims 6 to 15 in the present application have been obviated, and that all pending claims 6 to 20 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 14, 2008 By: /Linda Shudy Lecomte/
Linda Shudy Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646